

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 93 04:30:10 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #386  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest              Thu, 21 Oct 93              Volume 93 : Issue 386

Today's Topics:

CB instead of a no-code HF ham license?  
End-It All Now, Please ... (3 msgs)  
FCC Rulebook (4 msgs)  
Inflation (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: 20 Oct 93 10:27:21  
From: koriel!newscast.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!exodus!  
rfm@ames.arpa  
Subject: CB instead of a no-code HF ham license?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct19.002548.24024@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>The vast majority of QRP experimentation is with CW, for two reasons. First,  
>no modulator per se is required; to build the AM or FSK transmitter you've  
>mentioned would double the complexity.

Like, from three transistors to six? I think I can cope. It's occurred  
to me that an easy way to do the FSK one would be to literally duplicate  
the whole transmitter, tune the two clones to the right delta, and  
key them on and off just like CW.

> Secondly, since we're talking QRP  
>here, CW is actually useful given the lower noise bandwidth.

Irrelevant. The fun here is building it and having it work \*at all\*, not how many 599's I can get.

>  
>>3. I wanted to be able to occasionally work directly people out of the  
>> immediate area, without the elaborate antennas currently needed for  
>> DX satellites (Urban California is a land of small lots, plus portable  
>> operation on camping trips would be fun.)  
>  
>Elaborate antennas aren't required for the OSCAR satellites,

For the low altitude ones, no, but sometimes a little longer available time would be nice. The high-altitude sats seem to need at least a two-dimensional steerable beam, which would be darn hard to do on my lot without hitting a tree, a power drop, or the garage. When Palo Alto gets around to undergrounding the utilities in my neighborhood, things will improve. Also when phase 3D gets up with the new 1.2/2.3GHz modes the antenna size will shrink dramatically. I keep thinking about a hand-steerable dish or backfire for car camping trips...

Rich

--  
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 93 02:51:26 EDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!  
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kleinow@warhol.art.umich.edu (Leonard Kleinow) writes:

> Geoffrey S. Mendelson (gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com) wrote:  
> : As for passing the "giveaway" code test at 5wpm, Sorry I can't do it. at 5w  
> : I loose my place between dits and dahs. At 20 wpm, I can make out character  
> : and at 30 wpm they sound like one recognizable pattern. What I need is code  
> : at about 1 wpm using 30 wpm spacing. Eventualy I will be able to close the  
> : and will be able to copy code at 20-30 wpm. But I never will be able to pas  
> : the 5 wpm test.  
> : --  
> : Geoffrey S. Mendelson N30WJ  
>  
> Well, the ARRL exams, even at 5wpm, send the characters as 18wpm with 5wpm  
> spacing, known for some reason as "Farnsworth." Agreed, the characters

> sent using 5wpm dits and dahs are useless. but 18wpm chars sent at  
> 5wpm, I really think anyone can learn. There are great morse tutors on  
> the PC. Honest to gosh, I used one just called "Morse Tutor", and passed  
> that 5wpm test after only about a week of listening, an hor or two a day.  
>  
> It's a mental thing. Anyone can do it if they think they can.  
> Leonard  
> kleinow@warhol.art.umich.edu  
>

Again, I have a friend who CAN NOT distinguish between a dit and a dah at character speeds above maybe 6 or 7 wpm. To his ear it is all the same. Some people physically can not learn code. Maybe I can maybe you can, but others have a problem with it.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV |<=====| "An Elephant: A Mouse, built to  
N8PKV@mystis.wariat.org |From All| government specifications."  
dan@mystis.wariat.org | of Us | -L. Long  
dan@amcomp.wariat.org |<=====|

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 93 21:48:29 GMT  
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: End-It All Now, Please ...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <XV4NBc8w165w@jackatak.raider.net> root@jackatak.raider.net (Jack GF Hill) writes:

[ much deleted ]

>

>Therefore, pure fact and logic tell you that 2000 or 2001 are about as  
>early as non-code tested amateurs will have access, legitimately, to  
>the HF \*amateur\* allocations. That's six or seven years. It is also  
>the rules and the state of things... so, whether I agree that you  
>should have HF access without a Morse test as defined by the FCC or  
>not, the facts are that you'd be a great deal better off, assuming  
>you really want HF access, to get off your keyboard (unless you are  
>running SuperMorse or Morse Academy) and practice Morse. It is less  
>painful than you might think, and even though it may not be  
>"relevent", it is and will be required for at least the next six or  
>seven years.

>

Thanks Jack, for helping to put this ongoing debate/brawl into proper perspective. I don't think even the diehard code/no code activists can

bear the thought of seven years of this bickering on rec.radio.amateur.misc;  
I know I can't.

Folks, don't make the mistake of waiting to get HF access without a code test. You're missing out on a lot of fun you could be having right now, there is no telling how long you will be missing out, and the way things are going, by the time you get your HF access there may be nothing left of the HF bands. So go for it!

73

--

Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ  
kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com  
kevin%beacons@cyber.net

-----  
| o o \\_ / o o | Try Boatanchors  
| o o @ o o | For A Real Lift  
| ----- |

-----  
Date: 20 Oct 93 10:28:32

From: koriel!newscast.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!exodus!  
rfm@ames.arpa  
Subject: End-It All Now, Please...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CF45wp.2AA@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com  
(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>I'll bite. Your question is asking for a rational reason why we have  
>CW skills when all you want to do is talk on SSB.

Claiming that the only thing one would do without CW is "talk on SSB" is demonstrably false, see my recent posts on what I would do with a no-code HF license and why CB isn't good enough.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 19:07:13 GMT

From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!jreese@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: FCC Rulebook  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <931020.02079.GREGL@delphi.com> Greg Law <GREGL@delphi.com> writes:  
>Leonard Kleinow <kleinow@engin.umich.edu> writes:

>If you are really ambitious, you can order the Part 97 Rules and Regulation  
>from the FCC although this publication costs roughly \$35 and includes  
>many other parts.

The volume you need if you want to get it from the Government Printing Office is:

Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations

This has FCC parts 80 to 100. It includes the commercial two-way rules as well (which is why I got it). I paid \$24.00 at the local GPO bookstore.

If you only want part 97, I agree that the ARRL book is the one to get.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "I can do more in two minutes than Rush can in  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | three hours" --Jim Hightower

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 93 05:22:15 EDT  
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@ames.arpa  
Subject: FCC Rulebook  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greg Law <GREGL@delphi.com> writes:

[deleted to save bandwidth]

> If you are really ambitious, you can order the Part 97 Rules and Regulation  
> from the FCC although this publication costs roughly \$35 and includes  
> many other parts. I don't remember specifically, but a friend called the  
> FCC asking about it and was told he could order the document (I think it  
> includes something like Part 17 through Part 97) for about \$35. From the  
> way he described it, it sounds like a rather hefty document. I plan to  
> get more information on it this week and possibly order it.  
>  
> -- Greg KE4DPX

Greg, could you pass along what you learn. I for one would be interested, as I am sure others would.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV |<=====| "An Elephant: A Mouse, built to  
N8PKV@mystis.wariat.org |From All| government specifications."  
dan@mystis.wariat.org | of Us | -L. Long  
dan@amcomp.wariat.org |<=====|

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 15:37:31 GMT  
From: fluke!rem@beaver.cs.washington.edu  
Subject: FCC Rulebook  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2a1lciINNe1p@srvr1.engin.umich.edu> kleinow@engin.umich.edu (Leonard Kleinow) writes:

>  
>Where can one get a copy of the FCC Rulebook as it pertains to amateurs,  
>and/or Part 97?  
>  
The ARRL publishes an FCC rule book that you can find at your amateur  
radio supply store. Maybe even Radio Shack.

Randy  
AJ7B

---

Date: 20 Oct 93 15:56:44 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!  
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!gopher.cs.uofs.edu!  
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.ucsd.  
Subject: FCC Rulebook  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2a1lciINNe1p@srvr1.engin.umich.edu>, kleinow@engin.umich.edu (Leonard Kleinow) writes:

|>  
|> I knew enough of the rules to pass the test two weeks ago, but in between  
|> now and when I get my ticket in the mail I thought I'd study the real thing.  
|>

Nobody else does, why would you want to be different?? :-(

bill KB3YV

---

Date: 21 Oct 93 01:53:16 GMT  
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Inflation  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>Oh, except  
>for Ed Hare. He doesn't need a salary because he sleeps on a park  
bench and doesn't eat.

I've met Ed Hare. And, you know, if you throw a little cheap booze  
on his clothes (or, maybe buy him a little more of that cheap  
aftershave he seems to like so much) he really \*WOULD\* pass for  
a park bum!

I'm all in favor of giving Ed a raise, so he can buy some new  
clothes, and, more importantly, a microphone for his mobile HF  
station.

MD

--  
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -  
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com - Providence Firefighters Association:  
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz - We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet  
-- AT&TNet: 401-273-4669 -

-----

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 93 22:19:49 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Inflation  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

> You have made this point before, and it has been pointed out to you  
> that this corresponds to annual inflation of 7.2%.  
>  
> In 1968, it cost 5c to mail a letter locally. It now costs 29c, this  
> corresponds to an inflation rate of 7.3%.  
>  
> So tell us again what your point is?

Please, don't compare the Post Office with the ARRL. The Postal System is  
a for-profit venture, whereas the League is non-profit, staffed by  
volunteers. I guess the next thing you'll tell me is that the HQ Staff is  
paid a salary!

--Robert

-----

Date: 20 Oct 93 12:20:22 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Inflation  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert) writes:  
>oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:  
>  
>> You have made this point before, and it has been pointed out to you  
>> that this corresponds to annual inflation of 7.2%.  
>>  
>> In 1968, it cost 5c to mail a letter locally. It now costs 29c, this  
>> corresponds to an inflation rate of 7.3%.  
>>  
>> So tell us again what your point is?  
>  
>Please, don't compare the Post Office with the ARRL. The Postal System is  
>a for-profit venture, whereas the League is non-profit, staffed by  
>volunteers. I guess the next thing you'll tell me is that the HQ Staff is  
>paid a salary!

Nah, we're all independently wealthy. HQ is staffed by Lotto winners--all 120 of us. (You might be surprised to hear that there have been that many ham Lotto winners. Live and learn.) So, none of us need a salary because of our huge bank accounts. Oh, except for Ed Hare. He doesn't need a salary because he sleeps on a park bench and doesn't eat.

(Please tell me I don't need to add a smiley.)

-----  
Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org  
American Radio Relay League |  
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 13:40:37 GMT  
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <29sq1a\$hvd@news.delphi.com>, <CF2ysJ.1Hy@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1993Oct18.233049.13412@gsm001.mendelson.com>  
Subject : Re: End-It All Now, Please ...

In article <1993Oct18.233049.13412@gsm001.mendelson.com>,  
gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com (Geoffrey S. Mendelson) writes:

> All I want is to have some cw qso's so I can learn.

Of course, you've investigated the obvious, such as CW on 2mtrs.

Naturally, don't forget that you can just go off to a normal FM voice frequency and work modulated CW - so special equipment other than a DTMF pad needed.

And, if worst came to worst, you could always just get a receiver and listen to QSOs, copying both sides of the conversation.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan  
-- Population Studies & Training Center  
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
-- (401) 863-2668

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #386

\*\*\*\*\*